

ginning Christ saw the failure of his appointed agents, then to be consistent with his goodness and mercy, two things must follow: First, his coming should not have been delayed until scores and hundreds of wicked generations have gone to perdition, or second, in the new "dispensation" of universal salvation, there must be a probationary period for the millions who died in sin and wickedness without the superior advantages which this new "dispensation" promises to bring with it. When Christ was here on earth he said, "And I, if I, be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." Then just before he departed out of this life he promised to send the Comforter from the Father, the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, who, Christ declared would convict the world of sin, and then show them the Savior and induce them to believe in him. Chiliasm can make no tolerable disposition of this Scripture. We quote again from the article in question as follows:

If God had contemplated a general salvation in this dispensation he would have devised a plan that would have accomplished it.

That kind of logic is not very hot and is therefore not likely to burn any one very much, and warning would seem to be unnecessary. It deserves notice however. Because not all men are saved, therefore God did not contemplate universal salvation. Just what God contemplated in devising the plan of salvation we do not know, nor have we ever found any one who did know. Because not all men are being saved proves nothing as to what God contemplated. Because man made a universal failure, does that prove that God contemplated such a failure? Did God intend that sin and wickedness should deluge this world when he created man? Why, when God saw the wickedness of man's heart, did it repent him that he had made man? God changed his attitude, his relation, to man, because man first changed his attitude toward his Maker. Because all Israel was carried away into captivity, is that evidence that God contemplated such a state for Israel, and that if he had contemplated anything different he would have devised a plan that would have resulted otherwise? God's plan of salvation is a perfect plan and it contemplates the salvation of the race, it comprehends that, it is sufficient for that, and the fact that not all men accept it on the conditions offered, does not in any way affect the design or purpose of the plan. Again we quote:

The church that undertakes to save every soul in any community, state or country will fail in its object and why? Because it is not God's plan.

It can not be proven that such an effort would necessarily fail. If every member in every church in a community would be just what he ought to be, thoroughly consecrated to the Master, giving himself to the work of the Lord as the plan of salvation provides

that he should, consecrating not only himself, but his means and talents also, who will dare say that the last man in the community would not be brought to Christ? The failure to save every soul in a community must not be attributed to a lack of wisdom in giving the plan; it must not be attributed to the plan at all; it is not the fault of the plan. It is the fault of those whose business it is to execute the plan. The plan is perfect; a better one so far as we can see, could not have been devised. Until a church can be found in which every member has done his full duty, lived up to the fullest extent of his privileges, become such a power as it is possible for him to become under the conditions offered in the gospel for the development of Christian character and virtue, until then no one has a right to say that God's plan fails to convert every soul in a community. But even if it should, as already stated, that fact would not be evidence that it is not God's plan, or that God did not contemplate it. What part of a community is to be saved? Shall the church have any less aim than the conversion of every soul in a community? Is it contrary to God's plan to make such an effort? In II Tim. 2:4, we read, "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior who will have *all men to be saved*, and come unto the knowledge of the truth." Here it is expressly stated that it is God's will that *all men* should be saved, not any part of them, but *all*. In II Peter 3:9, we read, "Not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance." And Christ said it is not the will of the Father "that one of these little ones should perish." And again, "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent." Not only is it the will of God that all men should hear the truth, or that they should come to a knowledge of the truth, but that all men should be *saved*. Now if it is not God's plan that all men in any community should be saved, then clearly God's plan and God's will conflict. He wills one thing and plans another. Nay, verily not. Let it be the aim of the church to bring every soul to Christ. There is no danger of working against God's plan. For this purpose the church was organized, equipped and commissioned. Let her carry out her mission and fulfil her mission. Lastly we quote:

While universal salvation is not comprehended in God's plan, universal evangelization is. In Matthew we are commanded to teach all nations, in Mark we are commanded to preach the gospel to every creature.

We have never yet been able to see any just reason for this distinction which to us exists without a difference. To Christianize the world is as verily the command of Christ as it is to preach the gospel. The same command which makes it binding on the church to preach the gospel to every crea-

ture, makes it binding on the church to make Christians or disciples of all nations. Turn to the commission and read it according to Matthew: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations," etc. What is the command? It is to "disciple all the nations." The church has emphasized the *go* (not too much), but as if it were the principal verb in the commission which it is not. The principal verb in the commission is the one translated, "Make disciples of." This involves the preaching of the gospel, "but it marks pre-eminently the moment when the non-Christian is brought to a full willingness to become a Christian." It is not, "make disciples out of all nations" in the sense of, "from" all nations, but Christianize, disciple all the nations. To make Christians is as emphatically commanded as to "go." The commission requires Christianization as well as evangelization. Let this suffice for the present on this point. We favor giving the gospel to all the world, even if it were not commanded, love for lost souls should prompt us to that; but the time has come when we must publicly state that the principles and methods of evangelization as interpreted by the Christian Alliance people, we believe to be fundamentally erroneous, tho we credit the adherents of the doctrine with sincere, earnest consecration.

## Personal Mention

Brother Darling reports progress in his work in the city of Pittsburg. Several accessions lately.

Sister Gibbons reports a baptism at the Chicago Mission, a bright youth from the Sunday-school.

The communication from Brother Cassel deserves special notice, but no space this week.—See next.

Brother C. L. Eccard, West Milton, Ohio, asks us to say that he is open to a call for work as pastor of some church.

Brother J. S. Bowman is doing good work in the Old Dominion. He has been engaged to do evangelistic work in parts of Virginia.

Our readers will be pleased to learn that Brother Moomaw will be a regular contributor to this paper from this time forward.

From a communication by Brother Cassel we learn that Brother Smith will leave his present charge to take hold of the work in New Jersey.

Brother D. J. Meyers gave the office a friendly call last week, leaving with us some of the "stuff" that keeps this end of the business going. Call again.

Brother S. W. Wilt reports a very successful meeting at Evergreen, W. Va., and the organization of a new church. Eleven were added to the little flock.

After five years of lingering suffering, brother W. D. Furry's father died at Lappans, Md. To him death was a welcome visitor. Brother Furry has returned to his work at South Bend, Ind.

We call special attention to the notice by Brother Harrison on another page of this issue. Any one knowing the address of the person referred to will please give Brother Harrison the information desired.

Brother J. W. Beer gives a brief, tho interesting report of the California camp meeting which resulted in a number of accessions. Brother Beer has moved to Lathrop, which will be his address until farther notice.